DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 458 JC 750 478

AUTHOR Wallace, Terry H. Smith, Comp.
TITLE The Division/Department Chairperson in the Community College: An Annotated Bibliography.
INSTITUTION Pennsylvania State Univ., University Park. Center for the Study of Higher Education.
PUB DATE 75
NOTE 27p.; Prepared for the workshop "Division/Department Chairperson in the Community College" (Pennsylvania State University, June 30-July 3, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.95 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Personnel; Administrator Characteristics; Administrator Qualifications; Administrator Responsibility; *Administrator Role; *Annotated Bibliographies; *Department Directors (School); *Junior Colleges; Literature Reviews

ABSTRACT

With the intent of presenting significant items on the subject rather than an exhaustive listing, a thorough examination was made of entries on the role of the community college division/department chairperson catalogued over the last 11 years by Education Index, Resources in Education, Current Index to Journals in Education, and Dissertation Abstracts. Although the bibliography focuses on the role of the community college chairperson, a number of documents include references to selection and appointment procedures, the role of the chairperson in the secondary school or four-year college, and items developing out of, and indigeneous to, the two-year college. The major variables in the role of the chairperson are seen to be the chairperson himself, the scope of his responsibilities, the extent of his authority, his effectiveness, and the perceptions he, his faculty, and his supervisors have of his position. Major problems facing the chairperson are the ambiguity of his role, lack of training and orientation among those who hold the position, confusion about the nature of the position, often created by the advent of collective bargaining, and lack of general support from upper echelon administrators. Present research suggests that the position and nature of the chairperson's role will not change significantly over the next five years. (NHM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED111458

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE DIVISION/DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSON IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

an Annotated Bibliography

prepared for the workshop

"Division/Department Chairperson in the Community College"

June 30 - July 3, 1975

at

The Pennsylvania State University
University Park, Pennsylvania
16802

---

compiled by
Terry H. Smith Wallace
Graduate Student in Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University
and
Assistant Professor of English
Harrisburg Area Community College
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania
17101

JC 750 478

Foreword

Part of the preparation for our conference on the division/department chairperson in the community college consisted of an exhaustive review of the literature. This included Dissertation Abstracts, Current Index to Journals in Education, The Education Index, and ERIC. Once the review was accomplished, it seemed only appropriate to go one step further and publish the results in a form which would be of use to others.

Once again I turned to Terry Wallace, who has done such an outstanding job in earlier synthesis of the literature on staff development in the community college. Terry has done an outstanding job and I am pleased to share the results with you.

Dr. James O. Hammons
Workshop Leader, and
Research Associate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The Pennsylvania State University

INTRODUCTION

The annotated bibliography that follows offers a review of the literature pertinent to the role of the division/department chairperson in the community college. The purpose has been to present significant items on the subject, rather than an exhaustive listing. In compiling this survey a thorough examination was made of entries on the role of the division/department chairperson catalogued over the last twenty years by the Education Index, ERIC, the CIJIE, and Dissertation Abstracts.

While the literature search on which the bibliography is based encompassed two decades, the final list covers only the last eleven years and the bulk of references have appeared within the last seven years. In fact, when Richard C. Richardson reviewed the nature of departmental leadership in the two-year college in 1967, he concluded that, "if there is a dearth of information available on the departmental chairman in the four-year institution, the situation becomes a famine when we examine the literature of the junior college [Richardson, 1967, p. 244]." While the famine conditions of the middle sixties have not given way to a feast of observations, the larder is fortunately now stocked, at least moderately, with significant studies on the subject. However, much of the most substantive work--nearly half--exists only in dissertation form and remains to be published more widely.

Several criteria were used in selecting the items included here. First, as has already been noted, the bibliography focuses on the role of the community college division/department chairperson. While a

number of documents do include references to selection and appointment procedures, and to the role of the chairperson in the secondary school or in the four-year college, such material only appears here as incidental to the bibliography's primary concern. Second, items developing out of, and indigenous to, the two-year college were consciously sought, although observations from public school and senior college practitioners are included when deemed of value. Finally, in cases where two or more items covered the same subject with no essential difference in observations, only one was selected for inclusion. However, in instances where articles were developed from doctoral dissertations, both are presented in recognition of the broader scope, more thorough discussion, and more extensive data available in the latter for those who wish to study the matter in depth.

When one reviews the literature concerning the role of the chairperson in the community college, certain emphases become evident. These emphases have chiefly been aimed at answering several fundamental questions: (1) What is the role of the chairperson? (2) What are the overriding problems facing the chairperson as he seeks to fulfill his role in the two-year college? And, (3) what does the future hold for the position: the status quo or significant change?

The initial question (What is the role of the community college division/department chairperson?) is much more difficult to answer than it would initially appear to be. Inherent in the answer are those many variables that go into determining the complexity and

mercurial nature of the role and that make it to some extent unique in the case of each individual chairperson. The major variables seem to be the chairperson himself, the scope of his responsibilities, the extent of his authority (responsibility and authority do not necessarily go hand-in-hand in the case of the chairperson), his effectiveness or ineffectiveness, and the perceptions he, his faculty and his supervisors have of his position. All of these elements are fundamental to a proper delineation of the chairperson's role, for each influences the dimensions and possibilities of that role.

The first variable in the position is the individual who accepts the chair of the division or department. A number of studies (Gates, 1964; Pierce, 1970; Lombardi, The Department/Division Chairman, 1974) Forrester, 1974) have drawn a fairly clear profile of the typical office holder. He is predominantly white, male, middle-aged, a former instructor with a Master's degree, and more often appointed to his post by his supervisors than elected to it by the faculty. He normally teaches one to three classes, gets a small extra stipend beyond his instructor's salary, and often lacks the support from higher authorities and the aid in time, money, and clerical help he needs to do his job most efficiently. Last, his training for his role is non-existent or minimal. Yet, in spite of the negative elements in this picture, his position should not be considered of little importance.

Many observers of the office (Garrison, 1967; Koehnline and Blocker, 1970; Freligh, 1973) have suggested that it is a key one in the smooth functioning of the college as a whole, in maintaining and raising

faculty professional standards, and in the resolution of communication problems between faculty and upper-echelon administrators. Indeed, the chairperson ordinarily does have a hand in many significant administrative decisions. Personnel matters, from recruitment and staff development to evaluation and judgments on non-renewal or retention, receive his consideration. Administrative concerns, from scheduling to budget formulation and oversight, occupy him. He normally teaches and has a significant influence on the development of curricula and the improvement of instruction within his division. He often serves as the primary communications link for conveying the faculty's desires to the administration, the administration's desires to the faculty, and the student's desires to everyone (Lombardi, The Duties and Responsibilities, 1974). In some cases, the list of the chairperson's duties has become so staggering in length that some have concluded that he is simply expected to be all things to all people.

Yet the impression should not be drawn from this cursory glance at the responsibilities of the role that there is any standardization in them. The fact is that the duties carried by the chairperson vary widely from department to department, from college to college, and from region to region. For instance, the size of the college significantly influences the extent of the chairperson's responsibilities and the scope of his authority: Generally, the smaller the college, the more restricted the position (O'Grady, 1969; Russell, 1972; Forrester, 1974; and Sánchez, 1974). There are likewise important differences in the role on single-campus community colleges and multi-campus systems

(Freligh, 1973), and in different departments within the same college (Smith, 1970). One study (Turner, 1973) even turned up evidence that, at least in some Florida community colleges, chairpersons are not fully aware of their duties and administrative roles. Obviously, the role is a complex one: a complex one influenced by a multitude of variables.

Along with variation in responsibilities, of course, goes variation in authority. In some situations, like the eight New York community colleges that Blomerley (1969) studied, chairpersons have been found exercising major authority. However, this may be the exception rather than the rule. For instance, in nine Florida community colleges (Burnette, 1966), the position was found to possess only limited administrative power. Moreover, community-junior college chairpersons surveyed in the Southern Association (Sánchez, 1974) indicated that they lacked authority equal to their responsibilities--a situation, if true, crippling to attempts at effective fulfillment of the duties of the position and damaging to the effective governance of the institution. Yet, one of the major variables contributing to, or detracting from, the authority of the chairpersonship appears to be the individual who accepts the office. Lombardi, in The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in the Community College, concludes that "an energetic and resourceful chairman has many opportunities to exercise leadership and administrative initiative even in the most restrictive environment [p. 18]," and Engel (1974) suggests that personality may command where power is lacking. While shortcomings and inconsistencies in governing structures may restrict his role, the dynamic chairperson

can find ways to compensate for restrictions as he strives to achieve his goals.

Since the background, attitudes, and personality of the chairperson are important to success in the position, whatever its nature, knowledge of the qualities that differentiate effective from ineffective chairpersons would appear to be most desirable. Unfortunately, few writers have addressed this area. One that has (Ravetch, 1972) concluded (after surveying deans, faculty, and chairpersons on what they judged to be effective or ineffective in the latter's attitude and behavior) that the good chairperson is one who is open, available, democratic, organized, prompt, productive, current, independent, and selfless. His oppositive number was characterized as elusive, arbitrary, disorganized, indecisive, unreliable, deceitful, and egocentric. These vague profiles are, of course, incomplete and require more extensive research.

Happily, more information exists on the final major variable that contributes to determining the chairperson's role: the perceptions of that role by his faculty, his supervisors, and himself. Since human beings often act and react on the basis of their role perceptions and how they believe others perceive their role, this area of investigation is as important as any considered thus far. Misinterpretation, unperceived possibilities, conflicting views on the part of the three constituencies mentioned above, all spell trouble for the chairperson, his department, and his college.

In recognition of this, the research is substantial. The findings regrettably point, in most cases, to serious role confusion and role

conflict. One study (Smith, 1970) discovered major differences of opinion between faculty and chairpersons on the latter's role definition, and found the latter's role behavior failed to conform to that of any of the constituencies involved in the survey (including deans). Most research (Ravetch, 1972; Freligh, 1973; Stull, 1974; Hutchins, 1974)--whether national, state or local in scope--suggests the chairperson's role to be a veritable mine-field of misunderstandings, misconception, misperception, and consequently, conflict. For instance, Ravetch (1972) reports major disagreements among faculty, deans, and chairpersons on such fundamental aspects of the position as fostering faculty professional development, supervising instruction, affecting change---even the office's essential purpose was questioned. Even more serious, Turner (1973) found deans and chairpersons in conflict over their perceptions of both the latter's actual and ideal roles. Further, the chairpersons were discovered to be ill-prepared, and, as noted before, not fully aware of their duties and administrative responsibilities.

Despite discoveries like these, the picture is not entirely dark. In a comparison of faculty and chairperson viewpoints on the position at Arizona community colleges, Matthews (1969) found strong agreement between the two groups on both their ideal and actual role concepts of the chairpersonship---possibly because of the clear designation of the position as part of the faculty rather than the administration within these institutions. Apparently an unequivocally clear definition of the position is an important move towards allaying frustration and conflict over it.

Thus far the concern here has been for the basic nature of the chairperson's role and the variables that make it up. However, as attention is focused on the second major emphasis of the literature (What are the overriding problems facing the division chairperson as he seeks to fulfill his role), that emphasis is found to be intimately related to the complexity of the position as it has been reviewed and discussed above. Four major problems are identified in the research as of overriding significance: the ambiguity of the chairpersons's role, the lack of training and orientation among those who serve in the office, the confusion about the nature of the position often created by the advent of collective bargaining, and the lack of general support from upper-echelon administrators.

The first important problem--the ambiguity of the community college chairmanship--is to some extent inherent in the position and to some extent created by weak management at higher levels. Part of the inherent ambivalence stems from the fact that the chairperson is both teacher and administrator, both faculty and supervisor. Thus, as he carries the views of his division to higher echelons, they may perceive him as a faculty representative. However, as he administers his department and attempts to carry out the desires of deans and presidents, the faculty quickly identify him as a minion of higher-ups. The very origins of the position--a hybrid of the secondary school and the four-year college chairpersonships--bring together opposing structures of governance. Consequently, the office has been described as "the focal point of stress between the administrative structure and the governance structure [Richardson and others, 1972, p. 176]," and the chairperson

as "the nut in the nutcracker, the arms of which are the faculty and the administration."

Yet, while the role does contain a certain inherent ambivalence within itself, this need not be compounded by confusion over its exact responsibilities and authority. The literature is virtually unanimous in calling for clarification on these points, warning of serious consequences if a clearer definition is not forthcoming. One of the major works on community college governance (Richardson and others, 1972, pp. 176-177) has stressed: "Where relationships are not carefully specified or where an institution is undergoing a period of stress such as in the case of collective bargaining, division chairmen may be forced to renounce their normal ambivalence and make a clear choice between administration and faculty. This is seldom a happy experience either for the institution or the individual." Because of his critical position as the person in the middle, as the person at the focal point of stress between faculty and administration, as the individual bridging the gulf between them and acting as an essential agent of institutional communication, there must be some fundamental consensus among the parties involved as to the basic nature of his role if the two-year college is to avoid degenerating into two mutually exclusive and hostile camps.

The second overriding problem most chairpersons face is a lack of training for and orientation to their role. Little has changed since 1967 when the supply of able, imaginative chairpersons was termed "critically short" (Garrison, 1967, p. 49). The literature (e.g., Smith, 1970 and Turner, 1973) has repeatedly over the last few years recognized

the need for and recommended the establishment of orientation, and professional development programs. Yet some progress is being made in this area. One study (Harding, 1972), going beyond the mere identification of need, has designed and tested an instructional package for new departmental chairpersons. Furthermore, universities and educational associations have supported a growing number of professional development conferences similar to the ones on which Brightman (1971) and Grable (1973) report, and the present workshop for which the following bibliography has been prepared. However, though there appears to be progress in coping with the chairperson's lack of preparation for his work, the problem portends to be an ongoing one if the high turnover rate for the position continues to be a fact of two-year college governance.

A third major problem appears for the chairpersonship in institutions facing the advent of collective bargaining. Initially, the chairperson may be faced with major decisions about, and radically adaptation to, a new role, the nature of which he may have little or no say in determining. He may be forced to abandon the traditional ambivalence of his role and the significant leadership possibilities that are inherent in it. Further, he may find critical confusion over his relationship to the administration and the bargaining unit due to the ambiguity of his position. Research (Mortimer, 1972; Leslie, 1972) indicates that because of the complexity of the role, National Labor Relations Board decisions on his supervisory or non-supervisory position have been difficult to make and at times contradictory. In fact, the office may in some cases become a bargaining chip between the administration and faculty, and the nature of the position is negotiated

away for more valuable concessions with little thought or consideration for the chairperson who must adapt to and serve in the new order. Nevertheless, collective negotiations need not spell further confusion and/or disaster for him.

Ultimately, bargaining may be a boon to the individual caught between two worlds in an ill-defined, ill-supported position, which because of its very location is a focal point of conflict. The literature, fortunately, is addressing itself to some of the important issues affecting the chairperson's role. One study (Freimuth, 1974) has attempted to resolve the issue of inclusion or exclusion of the chairperson in faculty bargaining units by developing guidelines for determining his status. Another (Mortimer, 1972) suggests that the hierarchial structure of many community colleges may lead the chairperson to be designated as a representative of management, thereby clarifying his role. Whatever the final outcome may be, one conclusion is clear: that the chairperson must face the effects of collective bargaining squarely and adapt to the role changes it brings.

The final important problem facing most chairpersons is a lack of support---often a lack of supervisory support from upper-echelon administrators and almost always insufficient released time and clerical help to most efficiently fulfill his duties. The former shortcoming has already received extended attention above. The latter are recognized throughout the literature as problems that should be remedied. One writer (Freligh, 1973) notes that administrators seem to pay more lipservice to the importance of the position than real service, while another (Pierce, 1970) suggests that lack of time and support services are considered by

many chairpersons to be significant obstacles to role fulfillment. The fact of high claims coupled with low support for the office is just one more ambivalence in its ambiguous nature.

What can the chairperson hope for in the future? The continuing evolution of the office is the last of the three major emphases of the literature. Lombardi (1972, 1973, and 1974) predicts that the position and the nature of the chairperson's role will not change significantly over the next five years. On one hand, radical administrative experiments that have attempted to replace the chairperson, the discipline oriented department structure, or the more interdisciplinary though still discipline oriented divisional organization are few in number and their success has been at most very limited. The real trend seems to be from the departmental to the divisional organization. On the other hand, there will be, predictably, some erosion of the chairperson's authority with the advent of collective bargaining. However, the loss of power may be, to some extent, compensated for by a more clearly defined role. In short, though the office is in the process of changing, present research suggests the process will be a slow one.

As can be seen by this review of the emphases of the literature, important progress has been made in allaying the famine of information that Richardson reported in 1967. Nevertheless, serious gaps remain and the need for continuing study of the chairperson and his role is critical. Several areas require immediate attention:

(1) While the effects of retrenchment on the two-year college are

beginning to be studied, the chairperson's position and role in relation to this phenomenon has yet to receive consideration. There is presently a total dearth of information on what changes and stresses retrenchment is bringing on the office.

(2) The high turnover rate among chairpersons needs attention, along with the reasons for it.

(3) Continuing study is needed on ways to reduce the critical conflicts over the chairman's role perception among deans, chairpersons and faculty. Likewise, consideration needs to be given to ways of closing the gap between responsibility and authority that so often exists in the position.

(4) More research should be focused on the differences discovered by Smith (1970) between the roles of business-technology chairpersons and the heads of humanities, science, and social science departments. The effects of discipline orientation on the chairperson's role on two-year campuses has never been adequately investigated.

(5) The subject of what constitutes equitable compensation has not received profitable consideration despite the claim that compensation falls short of the demands of the office.

(6) Data are needed, too, on the possible advantages of assigning administrative assistants /to community college chairpersons to carry out routine duties in large departments.

(7) Finally, the advantages and disadvantages of the rotating chairpersonship of the community college campus should be investigated.

In conclusion, while a review of the literature pertaining to the role of the chairperson may be somewhat less than exciting, such work is imperative--yea, essential--in the light of the ambivalence and the complexity of the office. In the hands of an adept, knowledgeable individual, the position can be a key one for the community college in developing quality instruction, maintaining communication, and significantly advancing the mission of the institution. Yet, in the hands of a confused, ill-trained, ill-informed administrator, it can degenerate into a locus of dispute, despair, and disruption. Though a thorough knowledge of the literature can not compensate for fundamental shortcomings in the character of the individual chairperson, it can aid the new practitioner and the veteran: the new practitioner by clearly delineating the complex nature, problems, and potential of his role; and the veteran office holder by helping him to clarify, consolidate and reinforce his experience.

-Terry H. Smith Wallace
Harrisburg Area Community College
19 June 1975

THE DEPARTMENT/DIVISION CHAIRPERSON
AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

ERIC DOCUMENT (ED) numbers, CIJIE (EJ), and University Microfilm order numbers are presented, whenever possible, to expedite the retrieval of information, especially of items not easily obtainable from other sources.

Bandley, Marion K. A Report on the Status of Sabbatical Leaves for Administrators in California Junior Colleges. Stockton, California: San Joaquin Delta College, March 1970.

A study of the sabbatical leave policies for administrators at 80 California community colleges. Details on the number of colleges having such policies, the nature of those policies, the major obstacles to and the trends in granting sabbaticals.

Blomerley, Peter. "Junior College Departments and Academic Governance." Junior College Journal, Vol. 41 (February 1971), 38-40.

Reports the results of a study assessing the role of two-year college faculty in decision-making at the departmental level. Data were gathered from eight New York public two-year colleges to determine the department's status in the organizational structure; the influence of the chairperson; and the relationship between faculty influence, morale, and departmental objectives.

Blomerley, Peter. "The Public Two-Year College Department: A Study of the Role of the Department and Departmental Chairman in Academic Governance." Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1969. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 70-17, 309).

Basis of Junior College Journal article above. Studies the role of the department and the chairperson in governance of 8 New York community colleges with a stress on the influence of the chairperson and the faculty in the department's decision-making. Relationships between faculty influence in departmental governance and morale, and between faculty influence and departmental priorities also receive attention. Finds, among other things, that chairpersons exercise major authority in the colleges studied, though with some variance of influence in different decision areas (usually less in curriculum matters than those of personnel).

Brann, James and Emmet, Thomas A., eds. The Academic Department or Division Chairman: A Complex Role. Detroit: Balamp, 1972.

A volume of essays on the department/division chairperson's role in the university, college and community college. "The Division Chairman in the Community College" by William A. Koehnline and Clyde E. Blocker, "The Chairman as Academic Planner" by David Underwood, "Instructional Deans

and Chairmen in the Community College: A New Identity Crisis on an Old Theme" by Don A. Morgan, and "Duties of a Division Chairman at Harrisburg (Pennsylvania) Area Community College"---all relate to the two-year Chairperson's role.

Brightman, Richard W. Evaluating the Division Chairmen Leadership Conference of 1970. Costa Mesa, California: Coast Community College District, 1971. (ED 050 718)

Evaluation report of an August 1970 conference sponsored by the League on Innovation and aimed at delineating guidelines for leadership in the improvement of community college curricula and instruction. Conference topics included the evolving role of the division chairperson as an educational leader; his relationships with students, faculty, and supervisors; innovation for improved instruction; effects of administrative problems on teachers; and the development of vision and skill in division management.

Burnette, Jimmy Horace. "An Analysis of the Internal Organization Structures of Selected Public Junior Colleges in Florida." Doctoral dissertation, University of Florida, 1966. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 67-13, 173).

Delineates and analyzes the formal internal organizational structures of 9 Florida junior colleges and the positions, titles, and responsibilities of various levels within these structures. Also analyzes the roles of these levels in policy determination and implementation. Data on the division chairperson level indicates the position has only limited administrative power, authority, and responsibility. Finds the colleges more bureaucratic than collegial in structure.

Camp, Kenneth L. "The Role of the Administrative Supervisor of the Fine Arts Program in the Illinois Public Junior College." Doctoral dissertation, Western Colorado University, June 1973. (ED 093 393)

Survey of Illinois community colleges to establish the nature of the role of the fine arts administrative supervisor and the fine arts program in those institutions. Investigates if there is a uniform interpretation of terminology among the supervisors in describing their personnel, activities and procedures; if there are common weaknesses and strengths in the fine arts programs; and what similarities exist in the role of the supervisors.

Combs, Arthur W. "The Leadership Role of Department Chairmen as perceived by Chairmen and Faculty with Whom They Work in Selected Florida Junior Colleges." Doctoral dissertation, Miami University, 1972. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 72-29-444).

Studies the leadership role of department chairpersons in selected Florida two-year colleges and discovers that while the actual role is seen by both chairpersons and faculty in a similar manner, the actual role is not perceived as the ideal role. Suggests areas for future study.

Engel, Bernard F. "So You Want to be Department Chairman?" The Chronicle of Higher Education, May 6, 1974, p. 20.

An article light in tone but serious in nature on the leadership role of the department chairperson. Suggests that since the chairperson often lacks the support from deans and trustees to make orders stick, he must be adept at interpersonal relationships and quiet, understanding, persuasive communication. Though the article is directed at a four-year college audience, most of its observations are equally relevant on the community college campus.

Fiber, Larry and others. "The Role of the Department Chairman at Different Levels of Business Education." Business Education Forum, Vol. 26 (May 1972), 37-40. (EJ 058 472)

Delineates the business department chairperson's basic role in secondary schools, in community colleges, and in four-year colleges. Finds the general duties of chairpersons at all levels are similar, though the importance and scope of some responsibilities are greater on one level than on another.

Forrester, Joe Dale. "A Role Perception and Background of Social Science Division Chairmen in Public Community Junior Colleges in HEW Region VI." Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1974. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 75-1578)

Provides a general profile of the social science division chairperson and delineates significant differences between social science division chairpersons in large (+1500 students) and small colleges (under 1500 students) on academic, personnel, budget, and student oriented responsibilities.

Freligh, Edith Adele. "An Investigation of the Qualifications, Methods of Selection, and Terms of Office of Department and Division Chairmen, in Selected Public Two-Year Colleges in the United States." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1973. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 73-28,698)

Presents several significant discoveries: that leadership at the chairperson level is very important to the two-year campus, that practical administrative support (in time, money, secretarial assistance) has not matched administrative statements of high regard for the position, that qualifications and methods of selection are not clearly defined or consistently practiced even on the same campus, that multi-campus and single-campus chairpersonships differ significantly in all aspects, and that considerable frustration exists on all levels concerning the role of the chairperson.

Freimuth, James Edward. "Guidelines for Determining the Inclusion/Exclusion of Department Chairmen in Faculty Collective Bargaining Units in American Higher Education." Doctoral dissertation, The Florida State University, 1974. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 74-25-452).

Reviews all relevant National Labor Relations Board decisions and statutes, numerous chairperson job descriptions, and numerous collective bargaining agreements. Develops two sets of guidelines: one set delineates those job responsibilities which legal precedents have dictated as exclusionary; the other set may be used for determining the inclusion or exclusion of the chairperson based on his institutional job description.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967.

Many of the issues and problems raised by Garrison remain as important today as when he first delineated them in 1967. Sections on "The Teacher's Working Context" (pp. 20-28) and "Division and Department Heads" (pp. 49-51) discuss faculty perceptions of administrative personnel and suggest the role of the chairperson as a key one in maintaining and raising faculty professional standards, especially in larger institutions.

Gates, Claude L., Jr. "A Study of the Administrators of Technical Education Programs in the Public Junior Colleges of the United States." Doctoral dissertation, Tallahassee, Florida: Florida State University Graduate School, 1964. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 65-314).

A survey of 66 junior college technical education administrators. Reports on the typical administrator's characteristics and background, his duties and the curricula offered at most colleges.

Grable, John R., ed. Role of the Department/Division Chairman in the Community College. A Report of a Conference at Sam Houston State University Community Junior College Graduate Program, July 31-August 1, 1972. Huntsville, Texas: Sam Houston State University, April 1973. (ED 077 482)

Contains the proceedings of a conference on the role of the chairperson. Includes presentations by John Lombardi, "Role of the Department Chairman in Improving Community College Instruction" and "The Chairman in the Midst of a Revolution;" John E. Roueche, "Role of the Department Chairman in Staff Development;" Bill Priest, "The Division Chairman in the Multi-Campus Community College;" Richard D. Strahan, "The Role of the Department Chairman in Collective Bargaining;" Ruby Herd, "The Department Chairman Looks at Developmental Studies."

Harding, Louis Thomas. "An Administrative Instructional Package Designed for New Department Chairmen in Community Colleges." Doctoral dissertation, The Catholic University of America, 1972. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No.: 73-9123).

This work's purpose was to design, test and revise an orientation package to aid chairpersons in adapting to their new role. Describes the methodology and findings on which the package is based, including the observation that 75% of the chairpersons surveyed considered the division budget and class

scheduling as their most complicated responsibilities. Makes recommendations for defining and strengthening the chairperson's roles.

Hutchins, Elbert C. "The Role of the Community College Division Chairman as Perceived by the Dean of Instruction, Assistant Dean of Instruction, Division Chairmen, and Instructors of a Community College." Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1974. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 75-1584)

Studies the role of division chairpersons at a single community college to identify possible role conflicts within the institution. Discovers considerable incongruence in the perception of all respondents, suggesting a very definite possibility of conflict.

Koehnline, W. A. and C. E. Blocker. "Division Chairman in the Community College." Junior College Journal, Vol. 40 (February 1970), 9-12.

Suggests that the organization of the community college into academic divisions, rather than traditional departments,is one of the keys to efficient, successful administration of the two-year campus. Presents a "working definition" of administration, a description of the organization of divisions, and a discussion of the role of the community college division chairman--especially in the areas of curriculum and instruction, and of cooperation with the dean of students and the dean of business and financial affairs.

Leslie, D. W. "NLRB Rulings on the Department Chairmanship." Educational Record, Vol. 53 (Fall 1972), 313-320.

Reviews five recent NLRB rulings on the status of the department chairperson which suggest that decisions on whether he is a supervisor or a non-supervisor are difficult to make, because the role of the chairperson is complicated and sometimes ambiguous. The article stresses, by delineating serious questions on the viability of his position and the administrative stability of the institution, the importance, both to the chairperson and the college, of a correct decision on his status.

Lombardi, John. The Department/Division Chairman: Characteristics and Role in the Community College. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1974. Topic Paper Number 40. (ED 091 035)

Third in a series of studies on the role of the department/division chairperson in the community college sponsored by the National Institute of Education. Describes the characteristics and role (as an administrator and leader) of the typical chairperson. Draws conclusions on the present state of the chairperson's role, the position's ability to attract faculty, and the unlikeliness of significant role changes in the near future.

Lombardi, John. The Department/Division Structure in the Community College. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1973. Topical Paper No. 38.

The first in a series of studies on the role of the department/division chairperson sponsored by the National Institute of Education. Reviews the evolution of the department/division and factors causing changes in its structure. Analyzes its composition, its relationship to the college organization, and the growing significance of non-teaching members in the structure's governance. Probable changes and developments that will influence the department/division in the next five years are listed.

Lombardi, John. The Duties and Responsibilities of the Department/Division Chairman in Community Colleges. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior College Information, 1974. Topic Paper Number 39.

Second in a series of studies on the role of the department/division chairperson sponsored by the National Institute of Education. Reviews and analyzes the chairperson's duties and makes observations on his evolving role. Considers the chairperson's relationship with his immediate supervisor and his department/division. Examines the department's place in the administrative structure and reviews research work of the subject. Concludes that the value of the chairperson's performance usually depends on his own inner resources.

Lombardi, John. "Prospects for Middle Management." Change (Community College Supplement), Vol. 4 (October 1972), 32a-32d. (EJ 064 204)

Reviews the status of the community college chairperson's role. Notes its duality, "the alleged divisiveness of the department, and the efforts of administrators to substitute new models of organization" that attempt to eliminate the department/division structure and the chairperson's position. Suggests the effective trend is not toward these new models but from the departmental to the divisional form of organization.

Matthews, John I. "The Role of the Department Chairman in Arizona Community Colleges." Doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1969. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 69-20,783).

Compares responses of faculty and chairpersons pertaining to their perceptions of the latter's position in Arizona community colleges. Studies the position "in terms of qualifications, selection procedures, tenure, functions, responsibilities, and relationships as it relates to both actual and ideal conditions." Finds only a little disagreement in the perceptions of the two constituencies on the actual and ideal chairperson's roles, perhaps due to the acceptance of the chairperson as part of the faculty rather than the administration. Also discovers points at which the position can be strengthened and makes recommendations for further study.

McKeachie, Wilbert J. "Memo to New Department Chairmen." Educational Record, Vol. 49 (Spring 1968), 221-227.

While written for the university chairman, this article gives practical advice that can be useful to the two-year chairperson on such subjects as

recruiting tactics, faculty participation in departmental governance, course assignments, use of committees, and dealing with the dean.

Mortimer, Kenneth P. and G. Gregory Lozier. Collective Bargaining: Implications for Governance. University Park, Pa.: Center for the Study of Higher Education, Pennsylvania State University, 1972.

Analyzes some of the implications of collective bargaining as it affects academic governance. The section "Definition of the Bargaining Unit" (pp. 8-13) discusses the two-year chairperson's position as contrasted to the four-year in regard to the unit and suggests significant role changes can take place as a result of unionization and bargaining.

O'Grady, James P., Jr. "Role of the Departmental Chairman: Missouri and Illinois Two-Year Colleges." Junior College Journal, Vol. 42 (February 1971), 32-34.

This study has two aims: to determine the roles exercised by chairpersons at selected small and large two-year colleges and to compare those roles. Finds significant similarities and differences between chairpersons in small and large colleges in role status, in qualifications, budget administration, personnel administration, academic administration and general functions. Makes major recommendations for clarifying and upgrading the chairperson's role and suggests important aspects of the position in need of further research.

O'Grady, James P., Jr. "The Role of the Departmental Chairman in Selected Missouri and Illinois Two-Year Colleges." Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1969. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 70-1863).

Basis of the Junior College Journal article above. Delineates the roles of chairpersons in selected small and large two-year colleges, compares the roles and develops measures to aid administrators in assessing the role of the chairperson. Notes significant differences between small and large chairpersons in terms of role status, qualifications, budget administration, personnel responsibilities, academic duties, and general functions.

Pierce, H. B. "Look at the Science Division Head." Junior College Journal, Vol. 42 (November 1971), 28-31.

Notes the rise of the division chairperson on many two-year campuses, as opposed to the departmental chairperson. Reports the results of a national survey of 285 science division chairpersons on their role in regionally accredited two-year colleges. Information is given on personal data and background, their official job titles, responsibilities, and teaching demands.

Pierce, H. B. "The Role of Science Division Heads in Regionally Accredited Junior Colleges in the United States." Doctoral dissertation, The University of Mississippi, 1970. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 71-5499.

Basis for the Junior College Journal article above. Gives extended attention

to personal data and background, role definition, selection and appointment, responsibilities and activities, teaching, evaluation of instruction, major obstacles to role fulfillment, and chief satisfactions. Differences and similarities in the position between public and private colleges are investigated along with interregional differences. The data is also compared with the position as outlined in faculty handbooks.

Ravetch, Herbert W. "Responsibilities, Activities, and Attitudes of Selected Southern California Community College Department/Division Chairmen." Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1972. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 73-10,473).

Surveys faculty, chairpersons, and deans asking them to identify activities and attitudes of the chairperson they judged as effective or ineffective in carrying out the position's duties. Finds significant disagreement among the three constituencies on the chairperson's role in fostering the instructor's professional growth, in instructional supervision, in affecting change, and in the basic purpose of the position. Finds significant agreement among the three constituencies on what elements they consider effective and ineffective in the chairperson. Suggests that previous training or experience is unnecessary for the position, that chairpersons must be open but decisive, that they must accept the ambiguity in their role, and that they need expanded authority and clerical support.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr.; Blocker, Clyde E.; Bender, Louis W. Governance for the Two-Year College. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1972.

A major work on two-year college governance suggesting "a viable alternative to traditional practices of college administration and governance." Presents a "participative model" having as its aim "the development of cooperative relationships among all members of the college community as opposed to confrontation...." Chapter 8, "Administrative Specialization: Instructional and Student Personnel Services," discusses among other things the strengths and weaknesses of various forms of divisional organization which directly affect the chairperson's role.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr. "Departmental Leadership in the Two-Year College." Current Issues in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Association for Higher Education, NEA, 1967.

Pages 244-248 examine the functions of the two-year chairperson in comparison to his counterpart in the four-year college, the special characteristics of two-year institutions that influence the nature of the position, and the increasing importance of the chairperson in community college administration. The strengths and weaknesses of the position receive attention along with the considerations which influence the chairperson's appointment and effectiveness.

Russell, Clara Natalie. "The Role of the Departmental Chairman in the Junior Colleges of Oklahoma and Texas." Doctoral dissertation, the University of

Oklahoma, 1972. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 72-29,910).

Compares profiles of the chairpersons involved in the study on three dimensions: geographical location (Oklahoma versus Texas), age of the college, and size of the student body. Aspects of the role compared include qualifications, selection and appointment procedures, administrative responsibilities and the future role of chairpersons in English, Math, Physical Education, and Business departments. Finds very significant differences in the chairperson roles and profiles of large and small two-year colleges.

Sánchez, Aúgusto Vásquez. "Present and Preferred Administrative Responsibilities of Community-Junior College Division Chairmen in the Southern Association: A Comparative Analysis." Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1974. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 75-1602).

Investigates if there are significant differences between present and preferred responsibilities of chairpersons. Finds the majority of those surveyed indicated they do not possess authority equal to their responsibilities and that different measures of responsibility exist for the chairperson serving at small, medium and large community colleges.

Smith, A. B. "Department Chairmen: Neither Fish Nor Fowl." Junior College Journal, Vol. 42 (March 1972), 40-43.

Recognizes "the need to clarify the ambiguous nature of the chairman's role" and reports the results of a study to determine what faculty members, chairpersons and upper echelon administrators at 12 community colleges expect of their chairmen (with a view of arriving at a consensus regarding his role). Discovers some significant similarities and some serious disagreements among the three constituencies about the chairperson's role and makes recommendations for a clearer definition of his position.

Smith, A. B. "Role Expectations for and Observations of Community College Department Chairmen: An Organizational Study of Consensus and Conformity." Doctoral Dissertation, University of Michigan, 1970. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 71-15,310).

Basis of the Junior College Journal article above. Investigates (a) what faculty, chairpersons, and their superiors expect of the chairperson, (b) the role behavior of chairpersons, (c) consensus within and between positions relating to expectations, (d) the chairperson's conformity to role expectations, and (e) the influence on the role of certain variables within the department. Finds major disagreements between faculty and chairpersons on role definition, a lack of conformity by chairpersons to any constituency's role definition (including their own), and major differences between the roles of business or technology chairpersons, and those in humanities, social sciences, and sciences.

Snepp, Donald F. The Role of the Two-Year College English Department Chairman. N. Y.: Association of Departments of English, 1967. (Ed 014 498)

This study, while recognizing a number of similarities between the roles of two- and four-year English department chairpersons, emphasizes the important unique aspects of the former's role in the areas of prime administrative responsibilities and relations with students. This study also appeared in The ADE Bulletin, No. 12 (January 1967), 5-8.

Stull, William Arthur. "An Exploratory Study of the Role of Division Chairmen in the Virginia Community College System." Doctoral dissertation. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1974. Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms (Order No. 74-14,507).

Provides a detailed description of the chairperson's role; notes significant differences in perception of the role on the part of deans, faculty, and chairpersons; and identifies a reasonable level of satisfaction on the part of chairpersons concerning fifteen basic elements in job description.

Turner, Keith Stanley. "The Administrative Role of the Department Chairman in Florida Public Community Colleges." Doctoral Dissertation, The Florida State University, 1973.

Seeks to determine, analyze and describe the administrative role of the department chairman (including an investigation of his actual and ideal roles as perceived by him and by the academic dean). Observes that the published duties of the chairperson are unrealistic and unmanageable, that the perceptions of deans and chairpersons on the actual and ideal role of the latter are significantly different, that chairpersons are not fully aware of their duties or administrative roles, that chairpersons are ill-prepared, and that they may soon be faced with another role dilemma if collective bargaining appears and fails to clarify their position.

Welch, G. D. "Role of the Department Chairman in Collective Bargaining." Community and Junior College Journal, Vol. 44 (December 1973), 31.

A brief article suggesting that the departmental chairperson "can play an important role in the preparation and implementation of a master agreement" because of his daily contact with faculty, his intimate knowledge of departmental needs and problems, and his key position in the administering of the contract.

Worthen, Richard. The Junior College Chairman. N.Y.: Association of Departments of English, 1968. (ED 018 450)

Presents "10 postulates" relevant to administering a two-year English department and lists 9 related responsibilities. Discusses the important issue growing from the chairperson's dual position as a community college administrator and as an advocate of the discipline of English. This work also appeared in The ADE Bulletin, No. 17 (May 1968), 14-17.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF
LOS ANGELES
OCT 1 1975
CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION